

REMARKS

Claims 2, 6, 17-19 and 21-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 4 are canceled without prejudice, claims 6, 17-19, 21 and 22 are amended to clarify the subject matter therein, and claims 23-30 are added. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added by the new claims is found in at least claims 6, 21 and 22.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 2-4, 6, 7-19, 21 and 22 were objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Office Action asserts that claim 21 recites a plurality of comparators, but fails to clarify the relationships with the recited memory cells; and asserts that claim 22 recites the term "a signal between" and this term should read as "a voltage between."

Applicant herein amends claim 21 to further clarify the subject matter therein. Applicant also amends claim 22 to replace "signal" with "voltage." Applicant submits the requirements of the Office Action have been met. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 2-4, 6, 17-19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action asserts that claims 3, 4 and 21 recite subject matter that is inconsistent with the original specification. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 4 herein are canceled. Thus, the rejection of claims 3 and 4 is moot.

With respect to the rejection of claim 21, Applicant herein amends claim 21 to further clarify the subject matter therein, and asserts that claim 21 is commensurate with the original specification.

Accordingly, Applicant submits the requirements of the Patent Office have been met. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 2-4, 6, 17-19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 4-38866 (Adachi). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 4 are herein canceled. Thus, with respect to claims 3 and 4, this rejection is moot.

However, with respect to claims 21 and 24, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, Adachi fails to teach or suggest the features disclosed therein. In particular, Adachi fails to teach or suggest that one comparator serves to compare the input and output phases of more than one memory cell in a row of cells, as recited in claims 21 and 24.

More specifically, Adachi fails to disclose one or more comparators being fed from voltages on the first and third electrodes. In fact, even if Adachi could somehow be interpreted to imply a form of comparison, the exact form is not stipulated in any way. For example, Fig. 12C of Adachi shows a signal Vout taking two possible forms (one form being the inversion of the other), that relate to the embodiments shown in Figs. 12A and 12B of Adachi. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to compare the embodiment of Fig. 12A to the embodiment of Fig. 12B, there is no teaching in Adachi as to how such a comparison could be made. That is, one skilled in the art would not have been led by Adachi to a comparator that might serve to compare the input and output phases of more than one memory cell in a row of cells because Adachi provides no hint or suggestion as to how this could be achieved. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion in Adachi to drive a comparator from the two outer electrodes of the memory device, as shown in Figs. 12A-12C of Adachi, in order to make such a comparison.

Moreover, it appears one skilled in the art, based on Adachi, would simply measure the output voltage (V_{out}) across the middle and lower electrodes and observe the difference (the change in phase) corresponding to the two situations illustrated in Figs. 12A and 12B of Adachi. Even if one skilled in the art would have somehow been led to this act of measurement and observation, and such act could somehow be construed to be a comparison, such a "comparison" is not what is recited in the claims.

In addition to Fig. 12, the Office Action refers to Figs. 3-5 of Adachi when asserting that the present claims are anticipated by Adachi. However, none of these figures disclose the features of claims 21 and 24, as well as the claims dependent therefrom. Furthermore, with respect to Fig. 5, Fig. 5 fails to disclose anything explicitly relating to the subject matter of the present claims. In fact, Adachi refers to patent no. S63-32163 in connection with its Fig. 5. However, this patent document relates to steel cable, and not ferroelectric memories.


For the foregoing reasons, claims 21 and 24, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated or otherwise rendered obvious by Adachi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/bdh

Date: August 2, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461